

Faithful sharing of multipartite entanglement over noisy quantum channels

Soojoon Lee,^{1,*} Sora Choi,^{2,†} and Dong Pyo Chi^{3,‡}

¹ School of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea

² Basic Research Laboratory, Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute, Daejeon 305-350, Korea

³ School of Mathematical Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747, Korea

(Dated: November 13, 2018)

We present a protocol in which two or more parties can share multipartite entanglement over noisy quantum channels. The protocol is based on the entanglement purification presented by Shor and Preskill [Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000)] and the quantum teleportation via an isotropic state. We show that a nearly perfect purification implies a nearly perfect sharing of multipartite entanglement between two parties so that the protocol can assure a faithful sharing of multipartite entanglement with Shor and Preskill's proof on the entanglement purification.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn

During the last two decades, the theories on quantum communication protocols, such as quantum key distribution (QKD) [1, 2, 3] and quantum teleportation [4], have considerably been developed, and have improved quantum information sciences. Furthermore, quantum communication has almost attained to the practical stage.

A lot of quantum communication protocols [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] require perfect quantum channels, which can conventionally be obtained from entangled particles shared between two or more parties, even though quantum channels are typically noisy. Thus, in order to succeed in a faithful quantum communication via a noisy channel, first of all we have to find a process to share a nearly perfect entangled state in a given situation by means of local quantum operations and classical communication (LOCC), which are allowed to perform in quantum communication. The process is called the *entanglement purification*, which have been studied in several ways [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. In particular, quantum error correcting codes are closely related with entanglement purification protocols [7, 10, 11].

We first review the entanglement purification protocol presented by Shor and Preskill [10]. The protocol exploits the Calderbank-Shor-Steane (CSS) code [12], one of the representative quantum error-correcting codes, and has a merit that one can check the fidelity of the finally shared channel with a perfect quantum channel before completing the protocol, since the protocol was originally constructed in order to prove the security of the QKD protocol proposed by Bennett and Brassard [1]. Thus, if two parties successfully pass the checking procedure in the protocol, then they can share nearly perfect bipartite entanglements with high probability.

We consider the CSS code of C_1 over C_2 , which encodes m -qubits in n -qubits and can correct up to t errors, where

C_1 and C_2 are classical linear codes such that

$$\{0\} \subset C_2 \subset C_1 \subset \mathbb{Z}_2^n. \quad (1)$$

The entanglement purification protocol based on the CSS code is as follows: (1) Alice creates $2n$ Einstein-Podolski-Rosen (EPR) pairs in the state $(|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|)^{\otimes 2n}$, where

$$|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle|0\rangle + |1\rangle|1\rangle) \quad (2)$$

is one of Bell states. (2) Alice selects a random $2n$ -bit string b , and performs a Hadamard transform on the second qubit of each EPR pair for which b is 1. (3) Alice sends the second qubit of each EPR pair to Bob. (4) Bob receives the qubits and publicly announces this fact. (5) Alice selects n of the $2n$ encoded EPR pairs to serve as check bits to test for noises. (6) Alice announces the bit string b , and which n EPR pairs are to be check bits. (7) Bob performs Hadamards on the qubits where b is 1. (8) Alice and Bob each measure their qubits of the n check EPR pairs in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ basis and share the results. If more than t of these measurements disagree, they abort the protocol. (9) Alice and Bob make the measurements on their code qubits of $\sigma_z^{[r]}$ for each row $r \in H_1$ and $\sigma_x^{[r]}$ for each row $r \in H_2$. Alice and Bob share the results, compute the syndromes for bit and phase flips, and then transform their state so as to obtain m nearly perfect EPR pairs.

Here, $\sigma_a^{[r]}$ is defined by

$$\sigma_a^{[r]} = \sigma_a^{r_1} \otimes \sigma_a^{r_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_a^{r_n} \quad (3)$$

for a Pauli matrix σ_a , $a \in \{x, z\}$ and a binary vector $r = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n)$, and H_1 and H_2 are parity check matrices for C_1 and C_2^\perp respectively. We then obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 1: Shor-Preskill.— There exists an entanglement purification protocol between two parties, Alice and Bob, in which if they have greater than an exponentially small probability of passing the test then the fidelity of Alice and Bob's state ρ_{AB} with $(|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|)^{\otimes m}$ is exponentially close to 1.

*Electronic address: level@kias.re.kr

†Electronic address: srchoi@etri.re.kr

‡Electronic address: dpchi@math.snu.kr

Here, the fidelity F of σ with τ is defined by

$$F(\sigma, \tau) = \text{tr} \left(\sqrt{\sigma^{1/2} \tau \sigma^{1/2}} \right), \quad (4)$$

and we then note that

$$F \left(\rho_{AB}, (|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|)^{\otimes m} \right) = \sqrt{\langle\phi^+|^{\otimes m} \rho_{AB} |\phi^+\rangle^{\otimes m}}. \quad (5)$$

In this work, we are going to prove the following theorem by exploiting some appropriate LOCC and nearly perfect bipartite entangled states obtained from the entanglement purification protocol in Lemma 1.

Theorem 1.— There exists a protocol in which two parties can faithfully share a given multipartite entanglement over noisy quantum channels.

For the detailed proof of Theorem 1, we present some notations and two more lemmas.

Let

$$|\Phi_d^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle|j\rangle \quad (6)$$

be one of d -dimensional generalized Bell states. We remark that $|\Phi_2^+\rangle = |\phi^+\rangle$ and that when $d = 2^m$

$$|\Phi_d^+\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_2^m} |j\rangle_A |j\rangle_B = |\phi^+\rangle_{AB}^{\otimes m}. \quad (7)$$

We now consider a one-parameter class of states in $d \otimes d$ quantum systems, called the *isotropic states* [9],

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_F &= \frac{1-F}{d^2-1} (I \otimes I - |\Phi_d^+\rangle\langle\Phi_d^+|) + F |\Phi_d^+\rangle\langle\Phi_d^+| \\ &= \frac{d^2(1-F)}{d^2-1} \frac{I \otimes I}{d^2} + \frac{d^2F-1}{d^2-1} |\Phi_d^+\rangle\langle\Phi_d^+|, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $F = \langle\Phi_d^+| \rho_F |\Phi_d^+\rangle$. The isotropic states ρ_F have an important property that ρ_F is separable if and only if ρ_F has positive partial transposition if and only if $0 \leq F \leq 1/d$ [9], and furthermore several measures of entanglement for the isotropic states can be calculated by the explicit formulas [13]. Let \mathcal{T}_{iso} be the $(U \otimes U^*)$ -twirling operator defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{iso}}(\rho) = \int dU (U \otimes U^*) \rho (U \otimes U^*)^\dagger, \quad (9)$$

where dU denotes the standard Haar measure on the group of all $d \times d$ unitary operations. Then the operator satisfies the following two properties: $\mathcal{T}_{\text{iso}}(\rho) = \rho_{F(\rho)}$ with $F(\rho) = \langle\Phi_d^+| \rho |\Phi_d^+\rangle$ for any state ρ in a $d \otimes d$ quantum system, and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{iso}}(\rho_F) = \rho_F$. We note that \mathcal{T}_{iso} can be implemented by means of LOCC [14]. Employing the isotropic states ρ_F and the twirling operator \mathcal{T}_{iso} , we readily obtain the following lemma which has essentially originated from the results in [9].

Lemma 2.— Suppose that Alice and Bob share a state ρ_{AB} in $d \otimes d$ quantum system, $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, such that

$$\langle\Phi_d^+| \rho_{AB} |\Phi_d^+\rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (10)$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Then Alice can teleport any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ in \mathcal{H}_A to Bob in the state $\rho_{|\psi\rangle}$ satisfying

$$\langle\psi| \rho_{|\psi\rangle} |\psi\rangle \geq 1 - \frac{d}{d+1} \varepsilon, \quad (11)$$

by means of LOCC.

Proof of Lemma 2. First, Alice and Bob transform ρ_{AB} to an isotropic state ρ_F by employing the LOCC which can implement the $(U \otimes U^*)$ -twirling operator \mathcal{T}_{iso} , where $F = \langle\Phi_d^+| \rho_{AB} |\Phi_d^+\rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Then Alice teleports a given state $|\psi\rangle$ to Bob via ρ_F , using the standard quantum teleportation scheme. Let $\rho_{|\psi\rangle}$ be Bob's final state. Since the scheme produces the fidelity 1 via a maximally entangled state $|\Phi_d^+\rangle\langle\Phi_d^+|$ and the fidelity $1/\sqrt{d}$ via the maximally mixed state $I \otimes I/d^2$, it follows from Eq. (8) that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\psi| \rho_{|\psi\rangle} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{d(1-F)}{d^2-1} + \frac{d^2F-1}{d^2-1} \\ &= \frac{Fd+1}{d+1} \geq 1 - \frac{d}{d+1} \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This completes the proof. \square

The final lemma is a generalization of Theorem 5.3 in [15] into d -dimensional quantum systems.

Lemma 3.— Let \mathcal{E} be a quantum operation on a d -dimensional quantum system \mathcal{H}_A , and $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ a purification of a state ρ_A on \mathcal{H}_A , where \mathcal{H}_R is a reference system such that $\text{tr}_R(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) = \rho_A$. Suppose that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\langle\psi| \mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) |\psi\rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (13)$$

for all $|\psi\rangle$ in the support of ρ_A . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\Psi| [(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)] |\Psi\rangle \\ &\geq 1 - \left(1 + d_0 \cdot \max_{j \neq k} \{p_j p_k\} \right) \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where d_0 is the Schmidt number of $|\Psi\rangle$ and $\sqrt{p_j}$ are the Schmidt coefficients of $|\Psi\rangle$ with respect to the bipartite quantum system $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$.

Proof of Lemma 3. By the Schmidt decomposition theorem, $|\Psi\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{p_j} |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |\phi_j\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R \quad (15)$$

with $p_j \geq 0$ and mutually orthogonal $|\psi_j\rangle$'s in \mathcal{H}_A , and it clearly follows that

$$\rho_A = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|. \quad (16)$$

Then the left-hand side in Eq. (14) becomes

$$\sum_{j,k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\mu} p_j p_k \langle\psi_j| E_{\mu} |\psi_j\rangle \langle\psi_k| E_{\mu}^{\dagger} |\psi_k\rangle, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\sigma) = \sum_{\mu} E_{\mu} \sigma E_{\mu}^{\dagger}$ is the Kraus operator-sum representation of \mathcal{E} with

$$\sum_{\mu} E_{\mu}^{\dagger} E_{\mu} = I. \quad (18)$$

For $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$, we let

$$|\psi_{\theta}\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (e^{i\theta})^{q_j} \sqrt{p_j} |\psi_j\rangle \quad (19)$$

where $\iota = \sqrt{-1}$ and q_j are inductively defined by $q_0 = 0$ and $q_j = \sum_{l=0}^{j-1} q_l + 1$ for $j \geq 1$, that is, $q_j = 2^{j-1}$ for $j \geq 1$. Then it follows from Eq. (13) that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \varepsilon &\leq \langle \psi_{\theta} | \mathcal{E}(|\psi_{\theta}\rangle\langle\psi_{\theta}|) | \psi_{\theta} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,j',k,k'=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\mu} (e^{i\theta})^{q_j - q_{j'} + q_k - q_{k'}} \\ &\quad \sqrt{p_j p_{j'} p_k p_{k'}} \langle \psi_{j'} | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_{k'} | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_j \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

for any $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$. Averaging uniformly the last equation in the inequality (20) over all values of θ , from Eq. (17) we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \varepsilon &\leq \sum_{j,k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\mu} p_j p_k \langle \psi_j | E_{\mu} | \psi_j \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_k \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{\mu} p_j p_k \langle \psi_j | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_j \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \Psi | [(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)] | \Psi \rangle \\ &\quad + \max_{j \neq k} \{p_j p_k\} \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{\mu} \langle \psi_j | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_j \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We note that

$$\langle \psi_k | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_k \rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (22)$$

by Eq. (13) in the assumption of the lemma. Since it follows from Eq. (18) that for any k

$$\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\mu} \langle \psi_j | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_j \rangle = 1, \quad (23)$$

we get the following inequality:

$$\sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{\mu} \langle \psi_j | E_{\mu} | \psi_k \rangle \langle \psi_k | E_{\mu}^{\dagger} | \psi_j \rangle \leq d_0 \varepsilon. \quad (24)$$

Hence, from the inequalities (21) and (24) we obtain the inequality (14). Therefore, the proof is completed. \square

We remark that since $p_j p_k \leq 1/4$ for all $j \neq k$

$$\langle \Psi | [(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}_R)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)] | \Psi \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{d_0 + 4}{4} \varepsilon, \quad (25)$$

and that if $\rho_A = I/d$, that is, $|\Psi\rangle$ is a pure maximally entangled state in a d -dimensional quantum system then the right-hand side in the inequality (14) becomes

$$1 - \frac{d+1}{d} \varepsilon, \quad (26)$$

and hence with the result of Lemma 2, we readily obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1.— Suppose that Alice and Bob share a state ρ_{AB} in $d \otimes d$ quantum system, $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, such that

$$\langle \Phi_d^+ | \rho_{AB} | \Phi_d^+ \rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (27)$$

that Alice prepares another state $|\Phi_d^+\rangle$, and that Alice teleport the second half of $|\Phi_d^+\rangle$ to Bob via ρ_{AB} . Then the state which they finally share has the fidelity not less than $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}$ with $|\Phi_d^+\rangle$.

By virtue of the above lemmas, we now prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. For $N > m$, we let $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}$ be an N -qubit state which Alice and Bob want to share in the way that Alice and Bob possess $N - m$ and m particles, respectively, where \mathcal{H}_A is an m -qubit system, and let $\rho_A = \text{tr}_{A'} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$.

The protocol in which Alice and Bob can faithfully share $|\Psi\rangle$ is as follows: (1) Alice and Bob perform the entanglement purification protocol in Lemma 1, so that they can share nearly perfect states. (2) Alice and Bob transform the shared state to an isotropic state by means of LOCC. (3) Alice prepares the state $|\Psi\rangle$, and then they perform the standard teleportation scheme on m particles of $|\Psi\rangle$ via the isotropic state.

We now show that the above protocol can guarantee the faithful sharing of $|\Psi\rangle$.

By Lemma 1, Alice and Bob can share $2m$ -qubit state ρ_{AB} such that

$$\langle \Phi_{2m}^+ | \rho_{AB} | \Phi_{2m}^+ \rangle \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (28)$$

for some sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 2 that Alice can teleport any m -qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle$ to Bob in the state $\rho_{|\psi}\rangle$ satisfying

$$\langle \psi | \rho_{|\psi} | \psi \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{2^m}{2^m + 1} \varepsilon \quad (29)$$

by transforming ρ_{AB} to an isotropic state ρ_F with $F = \langle \Phi_{2m}^+ | \rho_{AB} | \Phi_{2m}^+ \rangle$.

Since all pure states in the support of ρ_A clearly satisfy the inequality (29), by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \Psi | [(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{A'}) (|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)] | \Psi \rangle \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2^m}{2^m + 1} \left(1 + d_0 \cdot \max_{j \neq k} \{p_j p_k\} \right) \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where \mathcal{E} is the quantum operation representing the standard teleportation via ρ_F , and d_0 is the Schmidt number

of $|\Psi\rangle$ and $\sqrt{p_j}$ the Schmidt coefficients of $|\Psi\rangle$ with respect to a given bipartite system $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'}$. Therefore, since ε is sufficiently small, the proof of Theorem 1 is completed. \square

We remark that the right-hand side in the inequality (30) is not less than

$$1 - \frac{2^m(d_0 + 4)}{4(2^m + 1)}\varepsilon, \quad (31)$$

by the inequality (25).

Since more than two parties can share a multipartite entanglement by sequentially executing the protocol for two parties, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.— Several parties can faithfully share a given multipartite entanglement over noisy quantum channels.

In conclusion, we have presented a protocol in which two parties can faithfully share multipartite entanglement over noisy quantum channels, and have shown that a nearly perfect purification implies a nearly perfect sharing of multipartite entanglement between two parties. Thus, we have finally proven that the protocol can assure a faithful sharing of multipartite entanglement with Shor and Preskill's proof on the entanglement purification. For example, if Alice and Bob want to share an N -qubit maximally entangled state such as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0^N\rangle + |1^N\rangle) \quad (32)$$

so that they have $N - m$ and m particles respectively, and if the fidelity of the quantum channel obtained from Lemma 1 with a perfect quantum channel is equal to $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}$, then by the proofs of the lemmas in this work we can clearly show that after completing the protocol the final shared state exactly has the fidelity

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{3 \cdot 2^{m-1}}{2^m + 1}\varepsilon} \quad (33)$$

with the original state in Eq. (32), where the fidelity in Eq. (33) is greater than $\sqrt{1 - (3/2)^m\varepsilon}$. Thus, if Alice and Bob appropriately choose the CSS code in Lemma 1 so that ε is sufficiently small, then they can share a state close to the original state. In the similar way, our protocol can be applied to a lot of quantum cryptographic protocols using multipartite entanglement. Hence, it could play a significant role in proving the security of those protocols.

S.L. acknowledges Prof. Jaewan Kim and Dr. Sangchul Oh in KIAS for useful discussions. S.L. was supported by a KIAS Research Fund (No. 02-0140-001), S.C. by the Korean Ministry of Planning and Budget, and D.P.C. by a KIAS Research Project (No. M1-0326-08-0002-03-B51-08-002-12) funded by the Korean Ministry of Science and Technology.

-
- [1] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in Proceeding of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175–179; IBM Tech. Discl. Bull. **28**, 3153 (1985).
- [2] A.K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
- [3] C.H. Bennett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3121 (1992).
- [4] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [5] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999); A. Karlsson, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto Phys. Rev. A **59**, 162 (1999); V. Scarani and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 117901 (2001); V. Scarani and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012311 (2002); S. Choi, J. Kim, and D.P. Chi, quant-ph/0306067, 2003.
- [6] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 722 (1996).
- [7] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [8] V. Vedral and M.B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
- [9] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 1888 (1999); P. Badziąg, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012311 (2000).
- [10] P.W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
- [11] H. Barnum, C. Crépeau, D. Gottesman, A. Smith, and A. Tapp, Proc. 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '02), pp. 449–458. IEEE Press, 2002.
- [12] A.R. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996); A.M. Steane, Proc. R. Soc. London A **452**, 2551 (1996).
- [13] B.M. Terhal and K.G.H. Vollbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2625 (2000); K.G.H. Vollbrecht and R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062307 (2001); P. Rungta and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012307 (2003); S. Lee, D.P. Chi, S.D. Oh, and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062304 (2003).
- [14] W. Dür, J.I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062313 (2000).
- [15] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 900 (1997).